The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

# STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

# THE CHANGING ENDS, WAYS, AND MEANS OF NATIONAL SECURITY

BY

# LIEUTENANT COLONEL HERBERT J. CARLISLE United States Air Force

### **DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:**

Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

**USAWC CLASS OF 1997** 

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

19970623 292



# USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

# THE CHANGING ENDS, WAYS, AND MEANS OF NATIONAL SECURITY

by

Lieutenant Colonel Herbert J. Carlisle United States Air Force

Chaplain (Colonel) John W. Brinsfield Project Advisor

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

US Army War College Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

#### ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: H.J. Carlisle (LTC), USAF

TITLE: The Changing Ends, Ways, and Means of National Security

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 7 March 1997 PAGES:23 CLASSIFICATION: Unclass

This paper explores the evolving ends, ways, and means of national security and recommends some potential methods to adapt for the future. It begins by looking at the events forcing the need for change. It examines the four revolutions in progress and how they affect national security. The geostrategic environment is changing, the world economy is growing and defense budgets srinking, and jointness and the revolution in military affairs are affecting how military forces are employed. Next, the paper outlines the current fiscal and programming management process to include the impact Congress and acquisition reform have on that process. Finally, there are some suggestions for possible courses of action to help move DOD boldly into the 21st century.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
PURPOSE	1
THE NEED FOR CHANGE The Changing World Additional Threats to National Security The National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy The Growing World Economy and Shrinking Defense Budget Jointness and the Revolution in Military Affairs	2 2 3 4 5 7
THE CURRENT SYSTEM ANALYSIS The JSPS The PPBS Acquisition Reform Congressional Involvement	9 9 11 12 13
SOME POTENTIAL WAYS TO ADAPT FOR THE FUTURE Strategic Vision Interagency Expeditionary Capability Congressional Oversight Efficient Use of Funds	14 15 16 16 17
CONCLUSION	19

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this paper is to explore the evolving ends, ways, and means of national security and recommend some potential methods to adapt for the future. The hypothesis is that the management practices of the Department of Defense and the way the US military plans, programs, and employs its forces in the future must change.

Three critical dynamics are in progress that necessitate the need to adapt. First, the security environment has been radically altered with the collapse of communism. The National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement has clearly changed the "ends" the military will be required to achieve. The result is that the US armed forces will be tasked to accomplish a much wider range of missions in a much broader spectrum of engagement with less clearly defined objectives or endstates. Second, the means with which to accomplish these ends has shrunk and will continue to shrink for the foreseeable future. The growing world economy, the extremely high cost of new systems, and the recapitalization of equipment exacerbate the problem of a declining budget. Finally, the revolution in military affairs (RMA) brought on by the revolutionary advancements in technology combined with the move toward jointness has generated a new way of employing military forces, "the ways" are in a revolutionary process.

I will support the above premise by looking first at the events forcing the need for change. I will examine the four revolutions in progress and how they affect the national security strategy. I will look at the types of environment the military will be operating in, detail the budget prospects for the future, and analyze the current fiscal and programming management process. Finally, I will suggest some possible courses of action necessary to help move the DOD boldly into the 21st century. The "ends", "ways" and, "means" of national security are all changing and the military management process must change along with them.

#### THE NEED FOR CHANGE

The need for change is being fueled by four revolutions currently in progress: 1) a changing world situation and balance of power, 2) a growing world economy and a shrinking DOD Budget, 3) the move toward Jointness-mandated by Goldwater-Nicholsand the, 4) technological changes creating the RMA.

#### The Changing World

The collapse of communism and the end of the 50 year old bi-polar security environment has significantly altered the geostrategic landscape. During the Cold War, there was the industrialized and free first world, a communist second world, and a largely non-aligned third world sought after by the super powers. The emerging world order involves a division of the world into three substantially different parts: market democracies, transitional states, and troubled states. These parts differ from the three Cold War worlds in two important ways. Ideology is no longer the basis of the division and the non-aligned states are no longer an important category. The market democracies comprise a growing group of free and prosperous nations. The transitional states include ex-authoritarian and ex-communist lands that are working toward democracy and free markets. The troubled states are generally failed nations and as a group are falling behind the rest of the globe economically, politically, and ecologically. Many of these states are plagued with rampant religious and ethnic extremism and all have an inadequate quality of governance.

The most likely conflicts in this emerging world system can be separated into three categories. The most dangerous and least likely to occur are conflicts among the major powers:

the US, Japan, China, Russia and the major states of Western Europe. Conflicts among regional powers on the other hand, are both possible and highly threatening to the US. In most cases these type of conflicts involve transitional or troubled states and occur as a result of aggressive moves by nations seeking regional hegemony. Finally, conflicts involving troubled states nearly always start within a single country usually in the form of a civil war as the result of a failed government. These relatively common crisis can escalate and threaten neighboring states and they usually create a humanitarian disaster.

# Additional Threats to National Security

In addition to these categories of conflict there are two other significant threats to US security resulting from the changing strategic environment. First and certainly one of the most threatening are transnational organizations such as crime syndicates, terrorist groups and, drug cartels. These threats have gained power as a result of technological advances, more open societies, and unprecedented free movement of goods, people and, ideas. They pose a significant threat to governments throughout the world especially market democracies.<sup>4</sup>

The second and most uncontrollable threat is that of natural disaster both at home and abroad. Within the US, natural disasters can cause terrible suffering and create a multitude of problems that must be dealt with rapidly. Abroad, natural disasters can create the same suffering and topple governments in transitional and troubled states.<sup>5</sup>

Overlaid on all these threats to national security is the potential for the use of weapons of mass destruction. With the break up of the former Soviet Union, maintaining control of weapons grade plutonium as well as chemical and biological weapons technology is increasingly difficult.

The proliferation and use of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons remains the most critical threat to the US.<sup>6</sup>

# The National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy

With the global order still in transition the US is struggling in the process of determining a coherent strategic vision and establishing priorities to support its national values and principles.

Compounding the problem is the fact that as the only country capable of reacting to situations throughout the entire world, the US is constantly called upon to intervene and solve problems.

The National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement states... "Our strategy is based on enlarging the community of market democracies while deterring and containing a range of threats to our nation, our allies, and our interests." The strategy stresses three primary objectives: enhancing security, promoting prosperity at home, and promoting democracy throughout the world. 9

In support of the National Security Strategy, the National Military Strategy (NMS) is one of flexible and selective engagement. The objectives of the NMS are to promote stability and thwart aggression through peacetime engagement, deterrence and conflict prevention, and fighting and winning the nations wars. At one end of the conflict spectrum, peacetime engagement involves the military in operations such as Nation assistance, Humanitarian operations and Peacekeeping. While on the other end of the spectrum, deterrence, conflict prevention, and to fight and win wars involves the military in actions such as nuclear deterrence, sanctions enforcement and major regional contingencies. <sup>10</sup>

Full coverage of the whole spectrum of conflicts under all circumstances would be extremely difficult and costly. Neither the current force structure nor defense budget will allow

that. <sup>11</sup> Some argue that without clearly delineated priorities the US spends an inordinate amount of time, effort, and money on places such as Somalia, Rwanda, and even Bosnia doing peacetime engagement and some conflict prevention. Few leaders in the military would argue the importance of these operations: however, we are doing them at the expense of being prepared for operations at the other end of the conflict spectrum. The present administration's position seems to be that since currently there is no immediate threat or near peer competitor, we do not need to modernize or re-capitalize our equipment. In general, the US military is better trained and has better equipment than any other nation in the world so it does not need as much force as in the past. <sup>12</sup> The result is we react and conduct peacetime engagement and conflict prevention in areas of the world that require immediate attention and neglect preparing for war and modernizing our equipment. Simultaneously we fail to engage areas of greater importance for the future such as China, India, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific rim.

Compounding the problem of the demands of peacetime engagement on the Department of Defense is the fact that the military is the only part of the US Government that is deployable and expeditionary. <sup>13</sup> In many situations that require peacetime engagement and conflict prevention measures other departments of the government are better suited to accomplish US objectives, however, they are not prepared to operate outside the United States. <sup>14</sup>

The growing world economy and shrinking defense budget

As a corollary to the changing geostrategic environment, the end of the cold war has had another profound effect. There is no longer a major ideological split in the world. A significant majority of the USSR led communist menace is gone. The peace among the major powers has made foreign policy seem less pressing to peoples in most developed nations. In the US, the

public is more preoccupied by domestic travails and their personal standard of living than on disputes or conflicts between or within governments in other parts of the world. Combine this preoccupation with individual well-being with information technology and globalization and the result is a rapidly expanding international economic interdependence. There is a growing world economy and it is taking on a prominent role in national security.<sup>15</sup>

Concerns about the economic foundations of national power are increasingly voiced in nations throughout the world. In the US, concerns about prosperity and employment are playing a greater role in shaping international affairs and foreign policy. The US is increasingly prone to place economic concerns ahead of military and diplomatic concerns. Some diplomats believe that US foreign policy is being auctioned off to the highest commercial bidder.

Additionally, the American government has put concerns about the budget deficit, low levels of national savings, and investment needs ahead of worries about the long-term impact of current reductions in military expenditures. Domestic social programs are perceived as far more important than modernizing the military. Therefore, as Congress puts more and more emphasis on a balanced budget, the obvious target for spending cuts is DOD. Along with that is the perceived belief that after winning the cold war a peace dividend is at hand. The result is a smaller portion of the discretionary funds go to defense and a greater portion goes to domestic programs.

The DOD budget is therefore shrinking and will continue to shrink for the foreseeable future. The 1988 budget (in constant 1994 dollars) was 400 billion; the projected budget for 1998 is 250 billion, the top line is down 40%. Within the defense budget, 65% goes to pay fixed costs (i.e. base structure) and 35% pays variable costs (i.e. procurement, operations and maintenance). The Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRACC) reduced DOD infrastructure 22%,

thus a 14.5% total budget reduction for fixed costs (.65X.22=.14). The rest of the reduction in the top line comes out of either procurement, a reduced force structure, or less money for operations and maintenance (O&M). To date the majority of this reduction has come from the procurement budget. From 1988 to present the procurement budget has gone from 135 billion to 35 billion. It is estimated that we need 60 to 65 billion just to re-capitalize what we have now, this amount does not include procuring new more modern systems. During the same period the frequency of operational missions has increased over 300% and the force structure has gone down 35%. The result of all this is a shrinking defense budget and force structure as a "means" to deal with a changing and more demanding national security environment as the "ends". At the same time, the jointness mandated by the Goldwater Nichols Act and the Revolution in Military Affairs are affecting the "ways" the US military accomplishes the security objectives with the given resources.

## Jointness and the revolution in military affairs

The jointness mandated in the 1987 Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act was the end result of poorly executed military operations. <sup>19</sup> The Desert One operation in Iran and the Grenada invasion illustrated the US military's inability to operate jointly. A succession of initiatives were unable to force the military to drop their parochialism's and start functioning as a joint team. <sup>20</sup> Then in 1987, the Congress stepped up their efforts and made Jointness a law with the Goldwater-Nichols Act. The desired endstate of this law was slow to develop but has finally started to materialize. The four services are in fact in a "jointness" revolution. Three examples of the increased Jointness are the newly published Joint Doctrine manuals, Joint Vision 2010, and the Joint Warfighting Center. An added impetus and obstacle for the joint revolution has been the

rapid decline in the defense budget. The obvious impetus is in the fact that with less money the services must become more efficient and rely on each other for certain systems/capabilities instead of each individually developing their own solution. The not so obvious obstacle is that parochialism reasserts itself as each service fights to keep its share of the declining budget.

The final revolution affecting the US military is the RMA. "An RMA occurs when the incorporation of new technologies into military systems combines with innovative operational concepts and organizational adaptations to fundamentally alter the character and conduct of military operations."<sup>21</sup>

There are two major ideas currently changing the conduct of warfare. First, standoff precision strike weapons combined with very effective sensors and command and control can be used to dominate the battlespace. The concept is to detect, identify, track, target, and destroy an opponent at a distance, instead of closing with him.<sup>22</sup> In many cases maneuver will be done with systems/weapons instead of forces. The second idea is information warfare. The definition of information warfare is; "protecting the effective and continuous operation of one's own information systems, and disrupting, degrading or, destroying the functioning of the opponent's". <sup>23</sup> Information technologies provide the ability to gather, process, and disseminate information in near real-time. The combination of stand-off precision weapons and information warfare will create a system of systems and significantly alter the character of battle.<sup>24</sup>

An additional aspect of the RMA is the rapid pace at which technology is changing. The current acquisition process cannot keep up with technological advances.<sup>25</sup> This is particularly true of computer systems which are at the core or the RMA. For example, the primary global sensor integration system located at the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) in Cheyenne

Mountain was in need of an upgrade to take advantage of new technology. Unfortunately, the new computer system, at a cost of one billion dollars, was outdated by the time it was finished.<sup>26</sup> An eight to ten year procurement cycle is too long.

The four revolutions in progress are coalescing to dramatically alter the "ends", "ways", and "means" of national security.

#### THE CURRENT SYSTEM ANALYSIS

The Department of Defense has two systems in place to allocate and apportion resources in order to develop the capabilities and plans to accomplish the national security objectives. They are the Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS) and the Planning, Programming and, Budgeting System (PPBS). The operation of the JSPS and the PPBS described below is the "perfect world" intention for how these systems should work, not necessarily how they actually work. Two major factors have influenced how these systems operate. First, as a result of inefficiencies in weapons procurement an acquisition reform program has been in progress since the early eighties. Second, the administration and congressional inputs to the system have changed over time and are often politically motivated.

#### The JSPS

Each year in the January/February time-frame the President of the United States issues a National Security Strategy (NSS) to guide government and military planning for the protection of our nation's security. This in turn leads to the Joint Strategic Planning System and the development of the National Military Strategy. The NMS is the guiding document that defines the objectives of our military forces, the "ends" we hope to achieve.

Prior to the writing of the NMS the Joint Strategic Review (JSR) is undertaken. The purpose of the JSR is to assess the strategic environment the military will operate in. It identifies the issues and factors that could affect the NMS in the mid-term and long-range.

The Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) is issued by the Secretary of Defense to the military departments to provide direction for the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System.

The Secretary evaluates the National Security Strategy, the NMS, and the JSR and determines the required shape of the military for the future. The DPG should tailor the forces to meet the emerging threats.

The Contingency Planning Guidance (CPG) provides policy guidance from the Secretary of Defense thru the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Combatant Commands. It outlines what he expects them to accomplish in their area of responsibility (AOR) and provides guidance for both deliberate planning and crisis action planning.<sup>27</sup>

The Chairman's Program Assessment (CPA) is the vehicle the Chairman uses to advise the Secretary of Defense on how well the program recommendations and budget proposals of the individual service departments conform to and support the strategic direction of the NMS as well as the priorities established by the Combatant Commands. Up until 1993 the CPA was a one-half page document that said basically the chairman agreed with the service programs. In 1994 the Chairman starting using the CPA to express his opinions on the individual service Program Objective Memorandum's (POM's) and the document has grown to several pages. It now gives the Secretary of Defense the advice of the Chairman to aid his decision making on which programs to support and which to cut if the approved budget does not cover them all. 29

### The PPBS

Title 10 establishes the requirement for the services to organize, train and equip the military forces of the United States.<sup>30</sup> The Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) is the method DOD uses to combine the four individual service POMs into the DOD budget. Each service has a unique system to develope their POM. The purpose of the service POMs is to plan, program, and budget for the organizing, training and equipping of the military forces. These trained and ready forces are then provided to the combatant Commander in Chiefs (CINC's) to carry out the national military strategy of the US.

The CINC's have an input to this PPBS via the Chairman of the Joint Chief's of Staff in the form of the CINC's Integrated Priority List (IPL). The military departments reference the IPL as well as the DPG from the Secretary of Defense to create the POMs. Despite these attempts to point all four of the POMs in one direction based on the CINCs' priorities, there are still in effect four stovepipes within the PPBS, one for each service.

Although Goldwater-Nichols established the requirement for the Combatant Commands to determine requirements, in practice this has not occurred. The CINCs' time is consumed by current operations and they do not in most cases have the organization or inclination to look very far into the future. As a result the IPL is a short to mid term look at the CINCs' needs and does not address the long term acquisition programs. The services, on the other hand, have the primary responsibility to plan and organize for the future. As a result, they are better prepared to develop POMs that look to both the outyears and the near-term.

Both the JSPS and the PPBS operate on a two year cycles with the JSPS starting on odd years and the PPBS starting on even years. The intent is for the two systems to compliment each

other with the JSPS establishing the requirements for plans and setting the strategic direction and the PPBS building the force.

# Acquisition reform

As military equipment has increased in complexity and cost over time the process of procuring this equipment has become extremely difficult. Acquisition reform has become a recurring theme at the pentagon ever since the early 1980's when procurement inefficiencies became public. The position of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition (USDA) was established to give one person (civilian) authority over all military acquisition. Also established was the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Advanced Technology (DUSD(AT)). The DUSD as well as the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) are responsible for guiding the research and development of advanced technology systems for military use. They produce the Defense Science and Technology Strategy which is the document that focuses research throughout the DOD. The USDA chairs the Defense Acquisition Board which has final approval authority over high cost and critical items in the defense procurement process.

Two more recent evolutions in the acquisition process are the expanded role of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), and the creation of the Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessments (JWCA). The JROC is chaired by the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS) and its members include the Vice Chiefs of the four services. The purpose of the JROC is to provide formal judgments on the validity of major military requirements before they enter the full acquisition process. The JROC assists the Chairman in writing his CPA and provides the Joint Chiefs reasoned, cross-serviced insights from senior experienced war-fighters regarding military requirements. To assist the JROC in their deliberations, a new analytic foundation has

been established, a process called JWCA. These assessments cover ten interacting warfighting areas and have become the main support for more direct integration between the JROC and the PPBS. The JWCAs are structured to develop cross-service perspectives regarding resource distribution, while at the same time generating innovative insights as to how to build joint military capabilities. The ten separate assessments are headed by a specific director on the Joint Staff and include members from the Joint Staff, Services, Office of the Secretary of Defense, CINCs, and other DOD agencies.<sup>36</sup>

# Congressional involvement

After the JSPS has evaluated the strategic environment and developed the plans and the PPBS has established the programming and budgeting to accomplish the strategic objectives then Congress enters the equation. Congress, the holder of the purse strings, has final approval authority over the budget submitted to them by the administration. The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman, and the JROC have all labored to create the best defense budget and acquisition program possible. At this stage the already difficult and laborious process is subjected to one of the worst aspects of the United States government, "pork barreling". The legislators subtract, add and make deals over individual program elements on the defense budget (as well as the budgets of all other departments) to accomplish their personal agendas with little regard for the advice of national security experts (both civilian and military). This process subverts national strategy to political "back scratching" and lengthens the acquisition timelines. 38

In a recent example the entire US defense establishment agreed that a greater sealift surge capability was a higher priority than more Maritime Prepositioned Ships (MPS).<sup>39</sup> As a result the budget submitted to Congress programmed 35 million dollars per ship to retrofit (in US

shipyards) some foreign built ships for strategic surge sealift, the ready reserve fleet (RRF).<sup>40</sup> Congress deleted the retrofit from the program and instead programmed 250 to 300 million dollars per ship to build new MPS ships. This move was counter to what defense experts felt was the higher priority for US security.<sup>41</sup> Congress did this in the sole mode of looking out for their districts, not the security of the nation.

This very political practice clearly distorts the entire budget process. In the last four years the US Army has not programmed the research, development and production of the Comanche into their POM despite the fact that it is one of their highest priority acquisition requirements. The reason is the US Army knows that the program has broad legislative support and it will be added to the budget at the congressional level. <sup>42</sup> By omitting the Comanche from the program, the Army can place other program elements at a higher priority and know the Comanche will be a line item add by Congress.

The practice can also result in procuring systems that are not necessarily the most needed. The power and importance of California in the political realm is responsible for the procurement of twenty-one B-2's, not a current overarching security requirement.

#### SOME POTENTIAL WAYS TO ADAPT FOR THE FUTURE

The four revolutions in progress dramatically affect the ends, ways and, means of national security. With the strategic environment established and a thorough understanding of the current management processes, some recommendations can be made on how to adapt for the future. The proposed changes must focus on accomplishing three things. First, the strategic vision and priorities of the US must be clearly and coherently stated and strategic objectives established.

Second, to prevent the military from becoming a hollow force, as has happened in the past, the Department of Defense must take the limited funds allotted for defense and manage them efficiently. The optimum distribution must be made to get the most capability across the entire spectrum of conflict for a fixed amount of funds. Finally, the jointness revolution and the RMA must be incorporated into the planning, programming and employment of military forces in order to give the US the capability to fulfill its strategic goals.

# Strategic Vision

Establishing a strategic vision and determining priorities is far and away the most important part of developing the national security strategy. It is also the part the military has the least input to. The executive branch and legislative branch of the government need to describe their desired vision of the future. Objectives must be clearly and coherently expressed and priorities established. The importance of the growing world economy cannot be underestimated on one hand, and it cannot be our sole determinant of foreign policy on the other hand.

The National Security Strategy and the National Military Strategy should be classified documents that provide the CINC's clearly defined goals and priorities for their AOR's. The NSS must also focus the acquisition strategy on tailoring our forces to accomplish the missions and defeat the threats of the future. In a transitional period with unclear objectives, as in the present, our distribution is out of proportion. Too much of the shrinking defense budget is spent on peacetime engagement which does not necessarily support our strategic goals in a particular area. Also, our current force is designed to defeat the soviet threat, not efficiently accomplish the evolving missions of the future.

# Interagency expeditionary capability

If our strategy is clear and points to a heighten need for peacetime engagement, then all elements of the government should participate throughout the world. It seems that the growing world economy and changing strategic environment necessitates US global presence. It cannot, however, all be done by the military. US government departments and agencies such as Treasury, Justice, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency need to develop an expeditionary capability and assist in peacetime engagement. It may even be possible to engage private industry in these types of missions once an area is secure. Making the world a safer place for commerce and trade can be turned into a profitable situation.

# Congressional oversight

One of the current problems in managing resources is that the planning and budgeting processes operate on different cycles while technology advances at a pace that the acquisition system cannot keep up with. The PPBS and JSPS are on two year cycles while the congressional budget authority occurs every year. The JROC and DAB attempt to reconcile these problems within DOD but they have no control over how Congress does line item adds and subtracts from the DOD submitted budget. To solve this time and tempo problem and fix the outyears, the Department of Defense budget should be on a two year cycle. Also, Congress in the form of the Armed Services Committees need to be involved in the Defense Acquisition Board process. They should be given the deciding vote in procurement decisions at the DAB after hearing the opinions of the security experts. Congress should not be allowed to do line item adds and subtracts after the DAB has finalized the program. If the approved budget is less than requested or Congress adds more money, let the JROC make recommendations and the DAB make the adjustments.

These changes would significantly reduce the turmoil and instability in acquisition programs. They would smooth the budgeting and programming process and speed up the acquisition cycle.

#### Efficient use of funds

The shrinking budget clearly spells the need to be more efficient, eliminate duplication of effort and truly become more joint. However, in some ways these fiscal constraints have had exactly the opposite effect. The services have become more dogmatic in support of their own programs, less willing to compromise, and in fact they are becoming less joint in the acquisition arena. A truly non-parochial joint system needs to be established to determine which programs are the most important. The PPBSs within each of the services are incapable of working together to make budget compromises. The Joint Requirements Oversight Council along with the DAB need to increase in responsibility and authority and ensure that there is no duplication of effort, all systems are interoperable and the limited resources are applied to those procurement programs that provide the greatest future benefit for the Armed Forces. The JWCA process must be institutionalized within the Joint Staff as well as the individual service departments and the assessments must foster consensus decisions.

DOD must also start incorporating good business practices. Privatization and out-sourcing could potentially save DOD significant amounts of money. Using private industry to accomplish some jobs that are not required to mobilize can strengthen our economy while providing the military with a lower cost alternative. Removing whole systems from the inventory like the F-111 can provide large savings. Old systems like the F-111 cost a significantly higher amount to operate. Newer systems like the F-16, with lower operating costs, can be adapted to fill the mission and because of their numbers they provide economies of scale. Finally, the services

duplication of effort needs to be stopped. For example, all four services are trying to develop a theater missile defense system The result is there are eight similar programs in existence, all with separate funding.

DOD also needs a more concerted effort in developing and producing dual use technologies. These technologies could help with economic prosperity and force modernization while maintaining a warm industrial base and reducing costs. Individual services need to work closely with private industry and battle laboratories to center their research and development programs on their core competencies. Service expertise in these core competencies needs to be maintained. At the same time, the planning, programming, and management process must bring these service capabilities together in a synergistic way to get the most combat power for the money.

Even with all the adjustments to the resource management process the fact remains that the approved budget for the foreseeable future will be less than requested. Currently, the force structure is shrinking while operational taskings are increasing in support of peacetime engagement. The money to pay for this peacetime engagement is coming out of the procurement budget. The military has to be able to accomplish missions across the entire spectrum of conflict. They cannot, as they are now, expend all our resources at one end of the spectrum at the expense of the other. It is the responsibility of the armed forces to be able to respond to emerging threats and not be caught unprepared to fight and win the nations wars, regardless of the short sightedness of the administration. The military needs to determine the proper force structure to be able to accomplish peacetime engagement, along with other departments in the government, and still pay for the modernization, recapitalization, and tailoring of the force to meet future threats.

We must provide our forces the equipment and training to be able to fight and win the nation's wars against any emerging adversary.

#### CONCLUSION

There is an ancient Chinese proverb that reads "may you live in interesting times". The world is definitely at an interesting time. The revolutionary changes in the geostrategic landscape, the world economy, and technology have created a fundamental change in the ends, ways, and means of national security. The traditional paradigms are gone and a new model is emerging.

Since it is so difficult to determine how long this transitional period will last we cannot afford to wait and see what happens, we must start adapting for the future now.

The structure, organization, and management of the US military must evolve to provide national security for the future, not cling to old ideas from the past. There is no clearly evident path to this end and the process will undoubtedly continue to change. We must start now on the road to the next period in world history.

The strength of a nation's economy as well as its military might will determine its place in the new world order. As a world power in a leadership position, the US must strengthen its economy and simultaneously maintain its military supremacy. In order to do that DOD must fundamentally change. With a clear strategic vision as the "ends" and a limited budget as the "means", the "way" the military manages and operates the forces must move to a new era.

The changes must start with the three ingredients to successful budget management, correct distribution, efficiency, and optimum procurement expenditures. Jointness must be fully embraced and service parochialism's stopped. Experts from different fields must work together to

create the system of systems that provides the most capability for the allotted funds. We must do what is best for the nation, not what is best for our service.

#### **ENDNOTES**

- Institute for National Strategic Studies, <u>Strategic Assessment 1996</u> (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1996), 1-4.
- Institute for National Strategic Studies, <u>Strategic Assessment 1995</u> (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1995), 1-3.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid., 4.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., 7.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., 11.
- William J. Perry, <u>Annual Report to the President and Congress, March 1996</u> (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1996), 53-62.
- Institute for National Strategic Studies, <u>Strategic Assessment 1996</u> (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1996), 160-162.
- 8 Ibid., X.
- William J. Clinton, <u>A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement</u>, (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1996), 11-12.
- John M. Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, National Military Strategy of the United States: A Strategy of Flexible and Selective Engagement, (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1995), 4.
- Institute for National Strategic Studies, <u>Strategic Assessment 1995</u> (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1995), 12-16.
- Perry, 2-10.
- Institute for National Strategic Studies, <u>Strategic Assessment 1996</u> (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1996), 109-130.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., 12-20.
- Dennis S. Ippolito, <u>Federal Budget Policy and Defense Strategy</u> (Carlisle Pa.: Strategic Studies Institute USAWC, 1996), 15-25.
- <sup>16</sup> Clinton, 27-32.

- Richard N. Haass, "Paradigm Lost: From Containment to Confusion," <u>Foreign Affairs</u> vol. 74 (January/February 1995): 46-48.
- Dennis S. Ippolito, <u>Blunting the Sword-Budget Policy and the Future of Defense</u> (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1994), 97-106.
- Douglas C. Lovelace, "Unification of the US Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 DOD Reorganization Act," <u>USAWC Selected Readings Course 3</u> vol. 1(1997): 15-19.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., 20-23.
- Perry, 83.
- Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Military Advantage Through Science and Technology (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1995), 2-8.
- Department of the Air Force, <u>Information Warfare</u>, Air Force Doctrine Division (Washington D.C.:US Department of the Air Force, 1996), 3.
- Robert J. Bunker, "Advanced Battlespace and Cyber-Maneuver Concepts: Implications for Force XXI," <u>Parameters</u> 26 (Autumn1996): 16.
- Collie J. Johnson, "Secretary Preston Underscores Dramatic Changes in DOD's Acquisition Arena," Program Manager (March/April 1995): 35-40.
- General H.M. Estes III, Commander-in-Chief US Space Command, interview by author, 17 December 1996, Carlisle, Pa.
- Title 10, United States Code--Armed Forces, sec. 113(g)(a) (1986).
- William A. Owens, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Military Procurement and the JROC", remarks delivered to the US Army War College class of 1996, US Army War College, Carlisle, Pa.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid.
- Title 10, United States Code--Armed Forces, secs. 153 and 163 (1986).
- William A. Owens, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Military Procurement and the JROC", remarks delivered to the US Army War College class of 1996, US Army War College, Carlisle, Pa.
- President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, <u>A Quest for Excellence</u>. <u>Final Report to the President</u> (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1986), 35-38.

- Mark Cancian, "Acquisition Reform: It's Not as Easy as it Seems," <u>Acquisition Review Quarterly</u> (Summer 1995): 196.
- James Sheldon, Instructor at Defense Systems Management College, "Role of Science and Technology Activities", teaching note for Acquisition Policy Department 1996, Washington D.C.
- Joseph L. Ralston, <u>JROC</u>, <u>Planning in a Revolutionary Era</u>, (Washington D.C. US Government Printing Office, 1996), 13-17.
- Department of Defense, <u>The Joint Warfare Capabilities Assessment Process</u>, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3137.01 (Washington D.C.: Department of Defense, 22 February 1996), 1-5.
- Ippolito, Blunting the Sword-Budget Policy and the Future of Defense, 31-33.
- William A. Owens, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Military Procurement and the JROC", remarks delivered to the US Army War College class of 1996, US Army War College, Carlisle, Pa.
- <sup>39</sup> General Walter Kross, Commander-in-Chief US Transportation Command, interview by author, 13 December 1996, Carlisle, Pa.
- 40 Ibid.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid.
- Department of the Army, <u>1997 President's Budget</u>, Army Budget 1997 (Washington D.C.: US Department of the Army, March 1996), 43.
- Lewis V. Frank and Frank L. Griffin, Cost Effectiveness Comparison: B-2 versus Cruise Missile (Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1990), 28
- General Accounting Office, <u>B-2 Bomber: Cost to Complete 20 Aircraft is Uncertain</u> (Washington D.C.: US General Accounting Office, 1994), 16.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Bunker, Robert J. "Advanced Battlespace and Cyber-Maneuver Concepts: Implications for Force XXI." <u>Parameters</u> 26 (Autumn 1996): 14-22.
- Cancian, Mark P. "Acquisition Reform: It's Not as Easy as it Seems." <u>Acquisition Review</u>
  <u>Quarterly</u> (Summer 1995): 190-205.
- Clinton, William J. A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, 1996.
- Estes III, H.M., Commander-in-Chief US Space Command. Interview by author, 17 December 1996, Carlisle, Pa.
- Frank, Lewis V., and Frank L Griffin. Cost Effectiveness Comparison: B-2 versus Cruise Missile.

  Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1990.
- Haass, Richard N. "Paradigm Lost: From Containment to Confusion." Foreign Affairs vol 74 (January/February 1995): 43-59.
- Ippolito, Dennis S. <u>Blunting the Sword-Budget Policy and The Future of Defense</u>. Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1994.
- Ippolito, Dennis S. <u>Federal Budget Policy and Defense Strategy</u>. Carlisle Pa.:Strategic Studies Institute USAWC,1996.
- Johnson, Collie J. "Secretary Preston Underscores Dramatic Changes in DOD's Acquisition Arena." Program Manager (March/April 1995): 30-54.
- Kross, Walter, Commander-in-Chief US Transportation Command, Interview by author, 13 December 1996, Carlisle, Pa.
- Lovelace, Douglas C. "Unification of the Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 DOD Reorganization Act." <u>USAWC Selected Readings Course 3</u> vol. 1 (1997): 1-73.
- Owens, William A., Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Military Procurement and the JROC." remarks delivered to the US Army War College class of 1996, US Army War College (1996)
- Perry, Dr William J. Annual Report to the President and Congress, 1996.
- President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management. A Quest for Excellence, Final Report to the President. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1986.
- Ralston, Joseph L. JROC, Planning in a Revolutionary Era, 1996

- Shalikashvili, John M. National Military Strategy of the United States: A Strategy of Flexible and Selective Engagement, 1995.
- Sheldon, James., Instructor at Defense Systems Management College, "Role of Science and Technology Activities." Teaching notes for Acquisition Policy Department, Washington D.C. 1996.
- Title 10, United States Code--Armed Forces. 1986.
- US Department of the Air Force. <u>Information Warfare</u>. Air Force Doctrine Division. Washington D.C.: US Department of the Air Force, 1996.
- US Department of the Army. <u>1997 Presidents Budget</u>. Army Budget 1997. Washington D.C.: US Department of the Army, March 1996.
- US Department of Defense. <u>The Joint Warfare Capabilities Assessment Process</u>. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3137.01. Washinton D.C.: US Department of Defense, 22 February 1996.
- US General Accounting Office. <u>B-2 Bomber: Cost to Complete 20 Aircraft is Uncertain.</u> Washington D.C.: US General Accounting Office, 1994.
- US Institute for National Strategic Studies. <u>Strategic Assessment 1995</u>. Washington D.C.:National Defense University Press, 1995.
- US Institute for National Strategic Studies. <u>Strategic Assessment 1996</u>. Washington D.C.:National Defense University Press, 1996.
- US Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President. Military Advantage

  Through Science and Technology. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office,
  1995.